



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

conditions out of which Mann's work arose, the contemporary changes which accompanied it, and, in the final chapter, some statement of the more important steps that have been taken since Mann's death. The tremendous growth in the extent and complexity of the machinery of the public school system; the increase in public taxation for the maintenance of the schools; the pouring out of private fortunes for educational endowment; the growth of the normal-school idea; the modifications in the course of study as well as in methods of instruction along lines clearly indicated by Mann—these points are well sketched. What we miss, however, is an evaluation, upon Professor Hinsdale's part, of the intrinsic significance of the underlying point of view, and the attempt to measure the import of external changes by reference to their intrinsic ideal. This, however, perhaps lay outside the scope of Mr. Hinsdale's book; and our failure to receive it should not make us less grateful for what he has so successfully accomplished. He has given the ethical intensity of Mann's own personality even if his appreciation of the ethic of the movement Mann represented is somewhat reserved.

JOHN DEWEY.

*Life and Public Services of Edwin M. Stanton.* By GEORGE C. GORHAM. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. Two vols., pp. xv, 456; xiv, 502.)

UNTIL recently Stanton was the only one of the great members of Lincoln's cabinet whose career had never been fully described. The two principal reasons for this were, that he neither sought nor obtained wide popularity, and that his public life was almost entirely confined to the War Department. For about ten weeks he was Buchanan's Attorney-General; and it was not until the shadow of death was upon him that he became a Justice of the Supreme Court. To write an important and interesting biography of such a man required a great amount of study and investigation, much enthusiasm, and considerable skill in the use of facts. Mr. Gorham possesses all these qualities, and has produced a work of extraordinary value; it is a zealous and successful defence and eulogy of our greatest Secretary of War.

Now for the first time we know the particulars of Stanton's life before 1860. The boy who was left so poor by his father's death that at the age of thirteen he had to become a clerk, did not receive a very encouraging start in life. Fortunately the petty clerkship was in a bookstore. From there he went to Kenyon College, where he continued his studies for more than two years, before lack of further means compelled him to return to earning a salary. For a time he expected to be able to complete his college education; but when he found this impossible he began to read law, and at the age of twenty two he was admitted to the bar. From near the beginning of his professional career Stanton displayed the elements of greatness. He worked eagerly and unremittingly, says his biographer, "not as an irksome necessity, but with a stimulating resolve

to win." He soon outgrew the small practice that was obtainable in such a place as Steubenville, Ohio ; so, in 1847, he went to Pittsburg to live. Within the next few years he won some very important cases in the Supreme Court of the United States, and had been retained in so many cases that he moved to Washington, near the end of 1856. It was only a short time before his abilities were recognized by Buchanan's administration and he was appointed as special counsel for the Federal government in some land cases that involved many millions of dollars. After we know of his prodigious industry and skill in detecting and defeating the Limantour land frauds we begin to appreciate the mental and physical energy of Edwin M. Stanton.

Stanton can be understood politically only when we bear in mind that he was almost entirely devoid of the instincts of the politician and of the reformer. He was a Jacksonian Unionist, and resented the reflection implied by Southern aspirations for secession and expansion. If he had ever been a genuine Free-Soiler he never could have stood by Buchanan in the infamous efforts to force slavery upon Kansas. Stanton was primarily a lawyer—a lawyer who would not defend the side that he knew to be wrong, but he was very likely to be influenced by his associations and prejudices after he once became interested in his case. Our author has a strange aversion to the politics of the period from 1840 to 1860 ; he can spare but nine pages for it. Yet it was the time when Stanton's political tendencies and traits should have manifested themselves. A man's failures and inconsistencies are often as important as his successes and logical persistence. Undoubtedly the truth is, that Stanton was bent on winning his law cases and did not care much more for freedom than Douglas or Buchanan did.

When Cass resigned from Buchanan's cabinet in December, 1860, and Jeremiah S. Black became Secretary of State, Stanton was chosen as Attorney-General, because he was a great lawyer. If any one man may be said to have prevented the peaceful establishment of the Confederacy, that man was Stanton ; this service would not have been performed if he had been a politician. Both the biographer and the subject appear at their best in the 110 pages that treat of the period between December 20, 1860, and March 4, 1861. There Stanton stands a lion in the path of the scheming, subtle, threatening secessionists and of the timid, weak Buchanan and of the pettifogging, inconsistent Black. After Stanton had called treason, theft and cowardice by their right names, Buchanan had to stop denouncing Unionists and decide whether, after all, secessionists were the only patriots and altogether right. Mr. Gorham's criticisms of the President and of Black are very effective, but not too severe. The perspective of treason and cowardice is well made.

For Lincoln to put at the head of the War Department, after Cameron's miserable failure, a man whom he hardly knew, except as a Democrat and a severe critic of his administration, was certainly very strange. "He was appointed," says Mr. Gorham, "because, in addition to his great ability, his restless energy, and his absolute honesty, he was an un-

conditional Unionist of the Democratic faith, and his appointment would be a proof to the country that Mr. Lincoln regarded the war as the people's war and not that of a party. His personal relations with General McClellan were known to be good, and it was hoped that his administration of the War Department would set in motion the army, the inactivity of which the general in command had attributed to a want of support from the Executive" (I. 240).

In June, 1861, Stanton had said that the corruption that surrounded the War Department seemed "to poison with venomous breath the very atmosphere," and that the army appointments were bestowed upon men whose only claim was their Republicanism,—“broken-down politicians without ability, experience or other merit.” Mr. Gorham gives us the particulars as to how Stanton reorganized the department and corrected abuses in many directions. Stanton had taken charge for the sole purpose of making it possible for the Federals to conquer the Confederates, and he seemed to have no other thought until the end. That is why he was impatient, terribly industrious, and often severe and rude. Those who fought with vigor and moderate discretion had his support and were pushed forward. Those who dallied or disobeyed orders thought him a relentless enemy.

McClellan belonged to the latter class, as is generally known. Although the author notices the differences with other officers, a sort of test-case is made of the complaints preferred by McClellan. The way in which this ever-complaining general is followed step by step, refuted out of his own mouth, criticized, ridiculed and cut with the sword of sarcasm comes so near to cruelty that the reader often begins to pity a general who had not capacity or courage enough either to fight like a Napoleon or to plot treason like an Arnold. Many others have reviewed McClellan's movements with severe criticism. Mr. Gorham has covered the man with contempt. Here are a few sentences taken from different places: "Throughout his military career, he always appeared to act upon the idea that those who desired him to fight were plotting his downfall" (I. 332). "He feared the enemy was so weak that he would abandon Richmond and go south without a fight, and yet so strong that he would crush the Union army. And so he stood still and did nothing" (I. 411). "It seems to have become the settled policy of General McClellan to act on the defensive towards the rebels, and to make offensive war only upon his own government" (I. 414). After relating how McClellan failed to obey Lincoln's positive order to pursue Lee after the battle of Antietam, and kept calling for supplies, especially cavalry horses, Mr. Gorham remarks: "In fact, he wanted almost everything. Obedience by him to the President's order seemed out of the question as long as there was stationery on which to make requisitions for what he already had" (II. 68). That this is not trifling sarcasm is made plain by Lincoln's telegram to McClellan: "I have read your despatch about sore tongue and fatigued horses. Will you pardon me for asking what the horses of your army have done since the battle of Antietam that fatigues anything?"

Sherman's quarrel with Stanton about the terms that he entered into with Johnston is treated with much more moderation, as it deserves to be ; but the vindication of the Secretary of War is no less complete.

About one-half of the second volume is devoted to the period of Reconstruction. Here the author has given too much space to general questions and to quoting from reconstruction documents where concise and careful summaries are the most that are needed. When Stanton takes up the long and bitter struggle with Johnson the story increases in interest and value, and much new material and original comment are contributed. The author seems to us to attribute too many of the acts of Johnson and of the ex-Confederate leaders to conspiracy and not enough to a perfectly natural prejudice against the negro and Federal interference. Likewise there were more prejudice and anger on the part of Stanton and the men who shaped Congressional reconstruction and tried to get Johnson out of the White House than is admitted.

As a defence of Stanton the work is a great success, but there seems to be room to doubt if it will make Stanton popular. The reasons for this are that the narrative is too long for the length of Stanton's career, and that there has been no attempt to make a careful and frank analysis of Stanton's character and traits in their weakness as well as in their strength. If the author would condense these octavo volumes into one and would give more space to a consideration of Stanton's peculiarities, he would spread the fame of his hero and win the popularity that he himself has already earned by his serious undertaking. Stanton deserves to be very prominent among a score of the greatest of our national heroes.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

*War Memories of an Army Chaplain.* By H. CLAY TRUMBULL, formerly Chaplain of the Tenth Regiment of Connecticut Volunteers. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898. Pp. x, 421.)

THIS is an interesting and valuable work, not primarily historical in aim yet casting upon the history of the Civil War a good deal of important light. The author's experiences covered nearly the entire period of the war, and were extremely varied and characteristic. His service lay in Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia and Florida. He was in many battles, among them some of the bloodiest, in several Confederate prisons, for a time in solitary confinement out of suspicion that he was a spy. This personal record is as entertaining as can be ; parts of it are thrilling. Much space is devoted to revelations of soldiers' character and morals, the author thinking with Archbishop Ireland, who during the war was chaplain to the Fifth Minnesota regiment, that "a chaplain can write much better than any one else about the inner spirit of armies." We do not consider this true. A chaplain cannot become familiar with the soldier's worst character or doings. He only sees the best phases. The best phases are, however, instructive, and no other writer, save Rev.